

REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The specification has been amended in view of the Examiner's objection. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are requested.

Attached is one replacement sheet of formal drawings. The specific changes being made are discussed below in the context of the Examiner's objections.

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 9, 18, and 19 being independent.

Claims 1-9, 18 and 19 have been amended. Applicant submits that support for the amendments can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they allegedly do not include certain reference signs mentioned in the specification. With respect to step numbers S1701-S1705 in Fig. 17, Applicant respectfully submits that those step numbers are in fact contained in that figure. Specifically, S1701-S1703 and S1705 are on the right side, bottom half of the drawing, and S1704 is located at the bottom. The reference number 250 in Fig. 2 has been amended to 205 as suggested by the Examiner. The recording material 7 and the item 9g have been shown in Fig. 2. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are requested.

The drawings are also objected to as allegedly including reference signs that are not mentioned in the specification. Applicant submits that many of the reference signs noted

by the Examiner are in fact discussed in the specification: 5d (page 9, line 4); 5e (page 9, line 5); 9a (page 10, line 10), 9b (page 10, line 11); 9e (page 10, line 9); and 9f (page 10, line 9).

Regarding reference numerals 30 and 32 in Fig. 2, those have been deleted from that figure.

Lastly, regarding the element 51 in Fig. 2, Applicant submits it is not the same as item 5i and, further, that items 50-52 are discussed at page 8, line 22 of the specification. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are requested.

Claims 1-5 and 18 stand rejected under 35.U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,436 (Rhoads). Claim 6 is rejected under 35.U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhoads, as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 2000-253241 (Kojima). Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35.U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhoads, as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03). Those rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed below.

As recited in Claim 1, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the features of rendering image data described using a description language, detecting information relating to invisible copyright data in the rendered image data, and controlling printing of the image data according to the detected information. Applicant submits that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least these features. Instead, Rhoads merely discloses that a photo-duplication kiosk detects the presence of copyright data stenographically encoded in data and controls printing of data. That patent does not disclose or suggest that printing of image data described using a description language is controlled in consideration of detected information relating to copyright. The other cited art fails to remedy the deficiencies of Rhoads.

Claim 18 recites similar features and is patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 9-12, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35.U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,298,446 B1 (Schreiber, et al.). Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35.U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber, et al., as applied to Claim 9, and further in view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

As recited in Claim 9, the present invention includes, among others, the feature of inquiring, prior to receiving by receiving means, whether to perform receiving by the receiving means using detected digital watermark information. Applicant submits that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least that feature. Schreiber discloses a system which performs copyright protection of digital images for use within a distributed server-client computer environment. However, it does not disclose the claimed inquiring step. The other cited art fails to remedy this deficiency.

Claim 19 recites a similar feature and is patentable for similar reasons.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and objections, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Brian L. Klock
Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
BLK/lmj

Approved
mmcx
09-20-04



FIG. 2

